DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 861 CS 214 047

AUTHOR Dickson, Tom
TITLE How Goes the Great Debate? A Study of "Censorship" and "Self-Censorship" and Their Effect on the Content of the Scholastic Press.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (76th, Kansas City, MO, August 11-14, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Censorship; *Faculty Advisers; Freedom of Speech; High Schools; *Journalism; Public Schools; *School Newspapers; School Surveys; Student Attitudes; Student Publications; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Journalism Research; *Scholastic Journalism; Self Censorship

ABSTRACT

A study examined censorship and self-censorship of the high-school press. Surveys were sent in April 1992 to student newspaper editors and advisers at 1,040 randomly selected public high schools across the United States. A total of 323 editors and 270 advisers responded. Respondents were compared to each other and to those in the sample obtained in a 1990 study of advisers. Results indicated that: (1) differences among respondents in the surveys were not statistically significant; (2) faculty advisers and student editors agreed about the extent of adviser pressure, prior review and prior restraint, and the amount of student intimidation, deference, and self-censorship taking place at their school; (3) journalistic practices were more likely than controversial topics to be the cause of problems; (4) the two characteristics most related to differences of opinion for both advisers and editors overall were both newspaper characteristics--source and type of publication policy; (5) the smaller the school, the more likely was the editor to get into trouble for printing controversial stories and the more likely the adviser was to have stressed that controversial stories not run; (6) advisers and editors agreed with the "Hazelwood" ruling; and (7) prior restraint, intimidation, and self-censorship did not cause student journalists to stay away from controversial topics. Findings suggest that debate over causes of the "bland, innocuous" scholastic press is built on faulty assumptions, including the assumption that overt censorship and intimidation have had a devastating effect upon the content of the student press. (Contains 20 endnotes and 8 tables.) (RS)

HOW GOES THE GREAT DEBATE?
A Study of 'Censorship' and 'Self-Censorship' and Their Effect on the Content of the Scholastic Press

Tom Dickson
Department of English
Southwest Missouri State University
901 S. National Ave.
Springfield, MO 65804
417 836-5107

A paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City, Mo., August 1993

Running Head: How Goes the Great Debate?

How Goes the Great Debate?
A Study of 'Censorship' and 'Self-Censorship'
and Their Effect on the Content of the Scholastic Press

Two viewpoints concerning the extent of secondary school press freedom have been debated for well over two decades and across at least three eras of scholastic press freedom: the pre-Tinker era (1948-1968), the Tinker era (1969-1987), and the Hazelwood era (1988 to the present).[1] At the heart of the debate is whether censorship or self-censorship is more to blame for what has been seen by a number of researchers as an innocuous and bland student press.

One viewpoint suggests that published content prohibitions, prior review, and overt censorship are the biggest reasons for the supposedly bland content of the student press, while another viewpoint suggests that unpublished content prohibitions and adviser pressure are more to blame. Such covert actions, the argument goes, intimidate student journalists -- thus negating the need for much overt censorship.

A position between the two extremes suggests that both viewpoints are partly correct and that both censorship and self-censorship are to blame for a bland student press. The consensus position is summed up well by Kay Phillips, who wrote about the North Carolina high schools that she studied:

> In all schools, advisers exert subtle pressure and, in practice, most of them are censors by the definition applied in this study: both cutting controversial material and instituting a policy or atmosphere of intimidation that causes students to refrain from printing certain materials in the school newspaper. Clearly, persistent student editor deference to such authority has a stultifying effect on the student press.[2]

Some of the varieties of controls on the student press were noted by Max James in his 1969 study of press freedom in Arizona. James found that four means of censorship, both overt and covert, were being used in the state:

(1) "Understood" prohibitions developed through previous years;
(2) Specific prohibitions issued yearly by the administration;
(3) Reading of pre-published copy by an administrator;
(4) Cutting off or threatening to cut off funds for the publication.[3]

In his 1983 study of high school editors, Nicholas Kristof isolated three factors that he thought explained the "vapid flavor" of many high school newspapers:

> First, many schools experience censorship at its most blatant form, where the adviser or principal prohibits publication of specific articles or editorials. Second, the principal or adviser may, without actually forbidding publication of specific articles, cultivate a climate of intimidation in which the cruder form of censorship is unnecessary. Third, many editors in traditional communities possess a stultifying deference that keeps them away from anything that might offend or shock a reader.[4]

The Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism reached a similar conclusion:

> Not only does direct administrative censorship stifle the free expression of ideas in specific cases, but also it creates an atmosphere in which faculty and students alike know that to deal with controversial issues is to court official disapproval and perhaps disciplinary action. It breeds faculty censorship and self-censorship by students who otherwise would be more inclined toward participating in a free press.[5]

Despite disagreements as to where to place the blame, therefore, researchers over a long period have tended to share three basic assumptions: 1) that school officials have shown little respect for student journalists' First Amendment rights; 2) that student journalists are too deferential to school authorities; and 3) that the student press tends to avoid controversial topics. An analysis of previous research, however, calls into question those assumptions.

Previous Studies

Studies in the pre-Tinker era found that scholastic press freedom was limited to the whims of school officials. In a 1965 study in Southern California, for example, Don Horine[6] concluded that advisers held "a tight rein" over student newspapers and that both advisers and principals supervised the newspaper closely. In

a 1969 Arizona study, Max James[7] found that 60 percent of the schools reported either censorship activities or punishment for what was published and another 27 percent reported a potential for censorship.

Research conducted in the decade following the Tinker decision in 1969 found that the decision had not led to as much of an increase in student press freedom as was expected because of the ruling. A number of the studies suggested that principals, advisers, and students were not aware of the extent to which student publications were protected by Tinker and later lower court rulings, and considerable differences in the extent of student press freedom existed based upon the size and location of the school.

The most-ambitious study of scholastic press freedom in the Tinker era was conducted by the Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism (the Kennedy Commission). Much like pre-Tinker studies, the Kennedy Commission's report concluded that censorship and self-censorship because of understood prohibitions were not only rampant but also were an inhibiting factor to good high school journalism. The commission determined that the amount of overt censorship depended mainly upon "the extent to which students attempt to deviate from the house organ concept of the paper."[8] The commission concluded that self-inflicted censorship by students was the most pervasive forms of censorship found. Despite much criticism of the Kennedy Commission's report, its findings were not contradicted by other Tinker-era studies. In a 1976 study, for example, Laurence Campbell, found strong support among principals and advisers for student press censorship.[9] In his 1976 Illinois study, James J. Nyka[10] concluded from his findings as well as previous research by others that high school students in Illinois and elsewhere in the country experienced only a limited amount of journalistic freedom despite the Tinker ruling.

In their 1980 study of principals, advisers, and student journalists in the Seventh Circuit (composed of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin), Robert Trager and Donna Dickerson[11] found that the amount of press freedom was related to the size of the school and the community. The smaller the school and the smaller the community, the more likely respondents were to state that the principal had the authority to use prior review. Also, principals in large schools were significantly more likely to review controversial material than were principals in small schools.

In the only national study of student editors in the Tinker era, Nicholas Kristof in 1983 also concluded that the amount of censorship had decreased little since the Tinker decision. Like researchers before him, he determined that editors were discouraged from aggressive reporting by "implicit or explicit threats or discipline that results in stifling self-censorship by the students themselves." He concluded that "a lack of conflict over censorship in a school is as likely to indicate a deferential and submissive editor as it is a tolerant principal."[12]

In addition, J. William Click and Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver concluded from national study of public high schools in the mid-1980s that the opinions of the principals and advisers "do not suggest a fostering of a free student press in American high schools."[13] Moreover, Kay Phillips concluded from interviews with advisers in North Carolina shortly before the Hazelwood ruling that advisers in all schools exerted "subtle pressure." on student journalists. She found that advisers both had cut controversial material and had instituted a "policy or atmosphere of intimidation" that had caused students to refrain from printing potentially controversial material in the school newspaper.[14]

Even though the Hazelwood ruling removed most Tinker-era restraints on school officials, researchers conducting surveys in three states shortly after the Hazelwood ruling concluded that few advisers anticipated changes in their publications because of the ruling.[15]

Research in the early years of the Hazelwood era confirmed that the ruling had not had much of an impact on scholastic press freedom. Studies also began to show that the content of the student newspaper was not as bland as had been expected. In his 1990 national study of newspaper advisers, for example, Thomas Dickson[16] found that few advisers thought the Hazelwood had resulted in more censorship or student self-censorship and that controversial topics were being written about routinely. In a national study of high school principals and newspaper advisers in 1991, Laurence Lain[17] also found that a majority of school newspapers had run stories on a variety of controversial topics. Similar results were reported by Jack Dvorak[18] after his national study of 1991. He found that more than 8 of 10 advisers stated that they had "a great deal" or "almost complete" freedom in advising and that only one in 10 advisers stated that students had less freedom of expression because of the Hazelwood ruling.

Also, in a study of Texas high school principals and student editors conducted in late 1991, Lorrie Crow[19]

found substantial agreement between student editors and principals concerning the extent of prior restraint that had taken place at the school. Most principals and editors reported that no stories had been kept from publication because they were too controversial or invaded a student's privacy, because they were too controversial, or because they attacked a teacher. Principals' and editors' responses to opinion questions, however, were all significantly different. Thus, research following the Hazelwood ruling was calling into question some long-held assumptions about student press freedom. Except for Crow's study in Texas, the research -- like nearly all research for the previous 25 years -- was based upon surveys of principals or advisers. In no national study since the Hazelwood decision did student editors have an opportunity to corroborate or refute what advisers and principals were stating about scholastic press freedom.

Analysis of previous research also called into question the validity of a number of pre-1990 findings. Few researchers before that time had defined "censorship" on their questionnaires, and definitions given in their articles varied considerably. While the term most often was used by researchers in the 1960s and 1970s to mean "prior restraint," some researchers in the 1980s began using a broader definition. Some of them used the term to mean prior review as well as prior restraint, and others defined it as "any official interference by intimidation or coercion with student control of the newspaper" or "any official interference with student control of the newspaper." Researchers using the broader definitions, of course, were more likely to find "censorship" than those using a more-restrictive definition.

Another definitional problem concerns the term "self-censorship." It could include any of the reasons for student self-restraint: because of intimidation, because of deference to authority, because of a desire not to be controversial, because of a desire to follow accepted practices of journalistic ethics, or because student editors do not see such stories as newsworthy.

Research Questions

Because such terms as "censorship" and "self-censorship" can be defined in a number of ways, various aspects of those terms were used in framing the research questions used in this study. Five research questions about censorship and self-censorship of the high school press were proposed:

1. Do faculty advisers and student editors agree about the extent of adviser pressure, prior review and prior restraint, and the amount of student intimidation, deference and self-censorship taking place at their school?
2. Are controversial topics a major source of conflict between advisers and editors, and what sort of stories are more likely to cause conflict?
3. What community/school, newspaper, and adviser characteristics are most related to differences of opinion about the amount of freedom at the school?
4. Do advisers and editors agree with the Hazelwood ruling?
5. Have prior restraint, intimidation, and self-censorship caused student journalists to stay away from controversial topics?

Method

In April 1992, surveys addressed to the Student Newspaper Editor along with a cover letter and a self-addressed business reply envelope were sent to a random sample of 1,040 public high schools throughout the country. A follow-up mailing was sent three weeks later. A total of 426 questionnaires were returned (41 percent). Of that number 323 were from editors, 98 were from schools with no newspaper, and five were not usable.

Surveys addressed to the Student Newspaper Adviser were sent to the same sample of 1,040 schools a month after the editor survey was sent. A total of 387 surveys were returned (37 percent). Of that number, 270 were from advisers, 113 were from schools with no newspaper, and four were unusable.

Respondents were asked to answer questions according to what had taken place in the preceding year. Advisers and editors were compared on the basis of a eight independent variables. In addition, other adviser variables were examined. Three of the independent variables were community/school characteristics: school location/region, community size, and school size. Newspaper characteristics investigated were whether the newspaper was a credit class, newspaper periodicity, presence of a school publication policy, type of publication policy, and source of the publication policy.

Adviser characteristics investigated included gender, number of college journalism hours, years of journalism advising/teaching experience, and number of memberships in journalism organizations. Several

categories of dependent variables were investigated: amount of prior review, prior restraint, adviser pressure, intimidation, deference, and self-censorship. Respondents also were asked their opinion of the Hazelwood ruling.

To ascertain the reliability of the samples, respondents were compared to each other and to those in the sample obtained by Dickson in his 1990 study of advisers. He sent a 36-question survey, cover letter, and stamped return envelope to the head of the English/Journalism Department at a random sample of 1,600 public high schools. Just under 32 percent of the questionnaires (504) were returned, 364 of them from newspaper advisers. The rest of the schools responding did not have a student newspaper.

The Findings

Respondents. Table 1 compares respondents in the 1990 study and those in the 1992 surveys based upon school size, community size, and school location/region. The differences between respondents in the three surveys were not statistically significant based upon community or school size or region of the country.

As Table 2 shows, no significant difference was found between the 1992 editor and adviser samples based upon community size, enrollment, region of the country where they were located, whether the newspaper was part of a class or not, frequency of publication, whether a written publication policy existed, or the content of the school policy. The only statistically significant disagreement concerned the source of the publication policy. Student editors were more likely than advisers to think that students were the source of the policy; however, that difference could easily be attributed to misperceptions about policies put into effect in previous years.

As a test of how close the fit was for advisers' and editors' responses in 1992 concerning self-censorship, adviser pressure, prior review, and prior restraint, a Pearson r correlation was calculated for average Cramer's V scores for responses to 20 survey questions on those topics. The correlation of .959 was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Research Questions. The answer to the first research question ("Do faculty advisers and student editors agree about the extent of adviser pressure, prior review and prior restraint, and the amount of student intimidation, deference and self-censorship taking place at their school?") was "yes," in most cases. Table 3 compares editors' and advisers' responses to the key questions on the 1993 survey. Responses of advisers and editors were most alike on questions of self-censorship (average V score = .049), though the responses to questions about adviser pressure were almost as similar (V = .050). The average score for questions about prior restraint was .075, also quite low.

Editors and advisers were quite far apart, however, in their opinions of the amount of intimidation felt by editors. Advisers were significantly less likely than editors to think the editor would get into trouble if he/she ran something controversial.

The two groups were quite close on one question on deference -- their opinion of how important it was to the editor that the adviser might find a story to be objectionable. A large majority of both editors and advisers thought it was important to editors. However, they were quite far apart on another question of deference -- the extend to which the adviser worries that the newspaper might include controversial stories. Advisers worry less than students think; therefore, editors may be more deferential than they need to be.

Concerning the second research question ("Are controversial topics a major source of conflict between advisers and editors, and what sort of stories are more likely to cause conflict?") student newspapers tackled a number of controversial stories. Both editors and advisers were most likely to state that libel was the cause of the most problems, followed by privacy, fairness and balance, inaccuracy, and controversial subject matter. Thus, journalistic practices were more likely than controversial topics to be the cause of problems.

Editors and advisers were essentially in agreement with the type of subject matter that caused the most conflict -- though a number of editors and advisers did not think that stories about any controversial subjects caused conflict. Stories about sex ranked first, followed by stories about birth control and abortion, and stories about drugs. According to editors, stories about divorce ranked fourth and political issues fifth, while advisers stated that stories about political issues ranked fourth and stories about divorce fifth.

The third research question was: "What community/school, newspaper, and adviser characteristics are most related to differences of opinion about the amount of freedom at the school?" Tables 4, 5, and 6 show V correlations for newspaper characteristics, school/community characteristics, and adviser characteristics, while Table 7 gives overall variance for editors' and advisers' responses. As that table shows, the two

characteristics most related to differences of opinion for both advisers and editors overall were both newspaper characteristics -- source and type of publication policy. The position of the two was reversed, however.

Source of publication policy was the variable correlated with the most variance among editors, and type of policy ranked first for most variance for advisers. Respondents at schools with an policy stating that the newspaper was an open forum and with a policy approved by students and/or the adviser rather than by the principal, the superintendent or the school board were most likely to give answers indicating that more press freedom existed.

Two community/school characteristics -- region and school size -- ranked third and fourth for variance for both editors and advisers based upon community/school and newspaper characteristics. Less press freedom was found at schools in the North Central region and in the South than in the Northeast and West, and less freedom was found at smaller schools.

Student editors in the North Central region and the South were more likely to get into trouble if they ran controversial stories, reporters in the two regions were more likely to refrain from doing controversial stories, and newspapers in the two regions were more likely to hold off running important stories because they were controversial.

The smaller the school, the more likely was the editor to get into trouble for printing controversial stories and the more likely the adviser was to have stressed that controversial stories not run. Principals at the smallest schools (under 500 students) also were more likely to use prior review than were principals in medium-sized and large schools.

Newspaper periodicity was somewhat more important than community size for variance in editors' responses, while community size was slightly more important than newspaper periodicity for variance among advisers. For both editors and advisers, whether class credit was given for being on the newspaper staff ranked seventh in variance. For all of those variables, few differences in responses were statistically significant.

When the three personal characteristics for advisers were compared with the community/school and newspaper characteristics, the number of professional organizations to which the adviser belonged ranked fourth for variance, years of teaching and advising experience was fifth, and number of college journalism hours taken was seventh.

The extent of the adviser's experience and the number of memberships in professional journalism organizations to which the adviser belonged were the adviser characteristics most related to the greatest variance in responses. While schools with advisers who had more memberships in journalism organizations were more likely to have more press freedom, schools with advisers with the most advising experience tended to have greater restrictions on that freedom.

The more experience the adviser had had, the more likely was the editor to have withheld a story during the previous school year, the more likely the adviser was to suggest that the editor not run a story, and the more likely the adviser was to have rejected an advertisement. On the other hand, principals at schools with experienced advisers were less likely to use prior review.

The more memberships in professional organizations, the more likely the adviser was to think that the editor would not get into trouble for running controversial stories and the more likely the adviser was to disagree with the Hazelwood ruling. Advisers with more than one such membership were less likely to think it was important to the editor whether the adviser thought a story might be objectionable and were less likely to have stressed that controversial stories not go into the newspaper.

Having an adviser with more college journalism training did not necessarily mean more press freedom at a school. The more journalism training the adviser had had, the more likely he/she was to think the editor had used self-censorship and the more likely the adviser was to have rejected an advertisement.

Only one personal characteristic for editors was analyzed, gender. It was the source of the least variance among the eight editor variables.

The answer to the fourth research question ("Do advisers and editors agree with the Hazelwood ruling?") was "yes." As Table 8 shows, editors were significantly more likely to have an opinion. When controlling for respondents with opinions, editors were significantly more likely to disagree with the ruling (81% to 69%, significant at .01 level of confidence).

The fifth research question was: "Have prior restraint, intimidation, and self-censorship caused student

journalists to stay away from controversial topics?" The answer appears to be "no." First, by far the majority of editors and advisers agreed that the adviser was not using prior restraint. The only areas of disagreement were that editors were more likely than advisers to state that the adviser had not withheld a news story because of subject matter, and editors were more likely to state that the adviser had not rejected advertising because of subject matter. Thus, ironically, in those two situations in which differences of opinion were found, editors were less likely than advisers to state that prior restraint had taken place.

In all cases, more than 60 percent of editors and advisers stated that the adviser had not used prior restraint. Also, more than 60 percent of editors and advisers stated that the principal had not tried to use prior restraint on a story or an editorial. In no more than 6 percent of schools was prior restraint of any type used fairly or quite often, according to both editors and advisers. Prior restraint was practiced most often at schools that did not have an "open forum" policy. Even at those schools, however, fewer than half the advisers practiced it.

Students were more likely to think advisers would worry about controversial subject matter being printed than was the case. However, editors were much more likely to show deference to advisers than to be intimidated by them (though nearly 40 percent were intimidated by the principal). The same situation most likely applies for reporters, as well.

A majority of editors thought that reporters had refrained from doing controversial stories because they might be seen as objectionable by the adviser. However, six-tenths of editors did not think the newspaper had failed to run important stories because the editor thought he/she would not be allowed to run them, and only 5 percent of them thought it happened fairly or quite often.

Because the amount of deference to the adviser is greater than the extent to which editors feel intimidated by the adviser, it might be accurate to say that reporters and editors are using journalistic self-restraint rather than using self-censorship because of intimidation. Reporters for student newspapers in schools located in cities under 50,000 population in the South and Northeast with under 1,000 enrollment without an open-forum publication policy and with a publication policy approved by the adviser or principal were most likely to hold off from doing controversial stories. It is clear that most student newspapers were not avoiding controversial issues, however.

Conclusions

It might be concluded that the censorship/self-censorship debate is focused upon two concepts for which researchers cannot agree upon definitions and upon a concept of newspaper quality that has not been defined satisfactorily. If this study has done anything to settle the great debate over the relative importance of censorship and self-censorship as causes of a bland, innocuous press, what it has done is to suggest that the debate needs to be focused on aspects of censorship and self-censorship.

The study also found that the debate is built upon some faulty assumptions. One such assumption is that overt censorship and intimidation have had a devastating effect upon the content of the student press. By far the majority of student editors stated that they have considerable discretion about newspaper contents and cover a number of potentially controversial topics. Critics of the student press appear to be wrong about the newspapers' contents or are using a high standard to measure those contents. While the content of no high school newspapers likely would compare to the coverage of a New York Times or the in-depth reporting of a Washington Post, few professionally produced community newspapers would fare well in such comparisons either.

Even if researchers can hone in on meanings and measurements of journalistic excellence, it seems clear from three decades of research that few if any high schools have operated with complete First Amendment freedom. Even school newspapers during the relatively protective Tinker era had court-approved limits on their freedom, and the Hazelwood ruling further restricted the independence of newspapers not designated as public forums.

This study has indicated that while the Hazelwood ruling probably was a death blow to any thought of instituting a press system in U.S. secondary schools with no content restrictions, it has not been an insurmountable barrier to scholastic press freedom or excellence. While the Hazelwood ruling legitimizes restrictions on the content of the scholastic press, it only gives school officials license to take away students' freedoms. It does not require that they do so.

This study found that press freedom is more likely to exist in larger schools, schools in larger communities, and schools in the West. However, community/school characteristics are not things that can be

changed readily if at all. Both newspaper and adviser characteristics, however, can be. The most evident newspaper characteristic that the school might change is its publication policy. As the study showed, when schools have an expressed policy that the newspaper is an open forum, prior restraint and self-censorship are much less likely. The study also found that who makes the policy is important to the amount of freedom allowed. Press freedom was greater at schools at which the students as well the adviser had a part in forming the policy.

In addition to the support for press freedom that liberal publication policies provide, advisers play an important role in determining what press freedom is allowed as well as in assuring that students are prepared to live up to the amount of press responsibility expected of journalists. Of the adviser characteristics investigated in this study, the number of professional organizations to which the adviser belonged was the most important factor related to the amount of press freedom allowed. It was particularly important in regard to the extent of the editor's intimidation and deference to the adviser and the amount of pressure the adviser puts on the editor to control content.

Two other adviser characteristics -- college hours in journalism and amount of teaching and advising experiences are things that can not be changed readily. However, this study found that adviser experience and journalism training can be negative as well as positive factors in the amount of press freedom existing. Membership in journalism organizations seems to moderate whatever anti-press freedom bias journalism training and journalism teaching and advising experience seem to impart to some advisers. Advisers, however, are just one of the key players. The other key plays are the principal and the students. Kay Phillips wrote about the importance of the three groups in maintaining press freedom in the secondary school. She stated in her 1988 study of press freedom in North Carolina:

> (O)ne clear, though intangible, piece of evidence asserts itself from this study. High school student newspapers are only public relations tools unless they are vibrant and well enough informed to effect needed change in the schools and promote the freedoms the United States stands for. The attitude essential to producing such newspapers must be found within the advisers, principals, and students who work on those newspapers. As with all education, if the adults do not inspire the young people with the importance of maintaining freedom of expression, that freedom can be lost.[20]

End Notes

[1]The divisions were used by, among other people, Robert P. Knight, "The Post-Hazelwood High School Press," Journalism Educator, 43 (Summer 1988), 42-43. The first two eras get their name from Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969), which stated that "(i)t can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate." The third era gets its name from Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 484 U.S. 260, 1988 (1988), which stated that school officials can restrict student speech when the action is "reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns."

[2]Kay Phillips, "Freedom of Expression for High School Journalists: A Case Study of Selected North Carolina Public Schools" (paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August 1989), 12.

[3]Max H. James, "Propaganda or Education? Censorship and School Journalism," Arizona English Bulletin, 13:1 (October 1970), 38.

[4]Nicholas D. Kristof, Freedom of the High School Press (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1983), 32.

[5]Jack Nelson, Captive Voices: The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), 24-25.

[6]Don D. Horine, "How Principals, Advisers and Editors View the High School Newspaper," Journalism Quarterly, 43 (1966), 344-345.

[7]James, "Propaganda or Education?"

[8]Nelson, Captive Voices, 43.

[9]Laurence R. Campbell, "Principals' Attitudes Toward Student Journalism and Freedom of the Press." Quill and Scroll Society, 1976, 22. (Typewritten.)

[10]James J. Nyka, "Censorship of Illinois High School Newspapers," 1976, p. 38. (Typewritten.)

[11]Robert Trager and Donna L. Dickerson, "Prior Restraint in High School: Law, Attitudes and Practice," Journalism Quarterly, 57 (Spring 1980), 135.

[12]Kristof, Freedom of the High School Press, 4.

[13]J. William Click and Lillian L. Kopenhaver, "Principals Favor Discipline Over Free Press," Journalism Educator, 43 (Summer 1988), 48-51.

[14]Kay Phillips, "Freedom of Expression for High School Journalists: A Case Study of Selected North Carolina Public Schools," 42.

[15]Paula Renfro, Bruce Renfro, and Roger Bennett, "Expectations of Change in the High School Press after Hazelwood: A Survey of Texas High School Principals, Newspaper Advisers and Newspaper Editors," Southwestern Mass Communication Journal, 4 (1988), 64-65; Dorothy Bowles, "Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier: National Press Reaction to the Decision and Its Impact in Tennessee High Schools" (paper presented at the 1989 Midwinter Meeting of the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, January 1989); and Thomas V. Dickson, "Attitudes of High School Principals About Press Freedom after Hazelwood," Journalism Quarterly, 66:1 (Spring 1989), 169-173, and Dickson, "How Advisers View the Status of High School Press Freedom Following the Hazelwood Decision" (paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, D.C., August 1989).

[16]Thomas V. Dickson, How Advisers View Changes in the High School Press in the Post-Hazelwood Era (study prepared for the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, December 1990).

[17]Laurence Lain, "A National Study of High School Newspaper Programs: Environmental and Adviser Characteristics, Funding and Pressures on Free Expression" (paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal, Canada, August 1992).

[18]Jack Dvorak, "Secondary School Journalism in the United States," High School Journalism Institute Insight, April 1992.

[19]Lorrie Ronae Crow, "The Impact of Texas High School Students' and Principals' Perceptions of Student Press Freedom Following the Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier Supreme Court Decision" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1992).
[20]Phillips, "Freedom of Expression for High School Journalists," 43.

Table 1. Comparison of Characteristics of Advisers and Editors to Respondents in 1990 Study

	Advisers 1990	Advisers 1992	Editors 1992
		School Size	
Under 500	42%	43%	43%
500-1,000	31%	26%	26%
Over 1,000	27%	31%	31%
		Community Size	
Under 10,000	49%	45%	45%
10,000-50,000	30%	29%	29%
Over 50,000	21%	26%	26%
		Location/Region	
Northeast	16%	14%	15%
South	26%	29%	32%
Central	34%	34%	34%
West	24%	23%	19%

Table 2. Comparison of Cramer's V Correlations for Advisers' and Editors' Responses to Survey Questions

Independent Variables	
Community/School Characteristics	
Location/Region	.060
Community size	.012
Enrollment	.008
Newspaper Characteristics	
Class for Credit	.057
Periodicity	.021
Presence of Publication Policy	.087
Type of Publication Policy	.041
Source of Publication Policy	.153*

* Significant at .05 level of confidence

Table 3: Comparison of Editors' and Advisers' Responses to Survey Questions Concerning Aspects of Censorship and Self-Censorship

	Ed.	Adv.	V[a]
Intimidation			
Would editor get into trouble for controversial story?			.119*
With adviser	12%	12%	
With school officials, but not adviser	39%	28%	
No	49%	60%	
Deference			
Is adviser's opinion important to editor?			.053
Not important or not very important	32%	28%	
Fairly important	47%	48%	
Very Important	21%	24%	
How much does adviser worry about controversy?			.250***
Not at all	21%	28%	
Not much	51%	63%	
Fair much/quite a bit	28%	9%	
Self-Censorship			
Do reporters hold off on controversial topics?			.050
Never	40%	35%	
Once in a while	50%	55%	
Fair often/quite often	10%	10%	
Has newspaper failed to run important stories?			.045
Never	60%	57%	
A few times	35%	39%	
Fairly/quite often	5%	4%	
Has editor withheld a controversial editorial?			.034
No	76%	73%	
Yes	24%	27%	
Has editor withheld a controversial story?			.065
No	79%	74%	
Yes	21%	26%	
Adviser Pressure			
How much has adviser stressed no controversy?			.112*
Not at all	45%	49%	
Not much	40%	43%	
Fairly much/quite a bit	15%	8%	
Has adviser suggested withholding an editorial?			.032
No	67%	64%	
Yes	33%	36%	
Has adviser suggested withholding a story?			.005
No	66%	65%	
Yes	34%	35%	
Prior Review			
Does adviser read newspaper before publication?			.112*
No/not often	5%	5%	
Fairly/quite often	13%	6%	
Always	82%	89%	

Table 3 (Continued): Editors' and Advisers' Responses to Survey Questions

	Ed.	Adv.	V[a]
Does principal read newspaper before publication?			.041
Never	62%	64%	
On occasion	21%	22%	
Fair or quite often/always	17%	14%	
Prior Restraint			
Has adviser told editor not to run an editorial?			.072
No	79%	73%	
Yes	21%	27%	
Has adviser withheld an editorial because of topic?			.017
No	63%	65%	
Yes	37%	35%	
Has adviser said a story could not run?			.056
No	64%	70%	
Yes	36%	30%	
Has adviser changed copy without telling editor?			.055
No	76%	71%	
Yes	24%	29%	
Has adviser withheld a story because of topic?			.108**
No	74%	65%	
Yes	26%	35%	
Has adviser rejected an ad because of topic?			.186***
No	83%	67%	
Yes	17%	33%	
Has principal rejected story/required changes?			.035
No	66%	63%	
Yes	34%	37%	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence
*** Significant at .001 level of confidence
Note: [a]Cramer's V correlation

Table 4. Cramer's V Correlations Indicating Importance of Newspaper Characteristics

	If Credit is Given		Periodicity of Newspaper		Type of Pub. Policy		Source of Policy	
	Ed.	Adv.	Ed.	Adv.	Ed.	Adv.	Ed.	Adv.
				Self-Restraint				
				Intimidation				
Q10	.066	.057	.125*	.079	.195***	.262***	.186*	.253**
				Deference				
Q11	.113	.062	.087	.072	.137*	.126	.170	.191
Q14	.071	.095	.089	.104	.171**	.148*	.216**	.143
				Self-Censorship				
Q12	.043	.038	.071	.094	.162**	.156*	.200*	.098
Q13	.059	.049	.041	.113	.249***	.229***	.222*	.283**
Q16	.062	.010	.108	.091	.195**	.203**	.172	.157
Q20	.048	.031	.082	.032	.067	.101	.192	.077
				Responsibility				
Q29	.058	.099	.048	.120	.142*	.035	.122	.098
	.065	.055	.081	.088	.165	.158	.185#	.163#
				Adviser Pressure				
Q15	.053	.065	.113	.115	.274***	.223***	.094	.129
Q17	.078	.081	.088	.190	.247***	.246***	.203*	.171
Q21	.049	.128	.016	.061	.226***	.221**	.160	.089
	.060	.091	.072	.122	.249#	.230#	.152	.130
				Prior Review				
Q26	.045	.101	.060	.059	.089	.111	.177	.042
Q27	.023	.088	.057	.111	.157**	.233***	.249***	.325***
	.034	.095	.059	.085	.123	.174	.213#	.184#
				Prior Restraint				
Q18	.016	.096	.135	.047	.261***	.212**	.176	.106
Q19	.117*	.030	.047	.074	.188**	.182*	.181	.092
Q22	.027	.014	.059	.017	.128	.181*	.234*	.102
Q23	.007	.002	.135	.075	.047	.095	.132	.155
Q24	.014	.026	.081	.091	.194**	.107	.185	.037
Q25	.114	.134	.080	.039	.052	.105	.131	.213
Q28	.098	.077	.033	.056	.263***	.252***	.388***	.355***
	.056	.053	.081	.057	.162	.162#	.204#	.151
				Opinion of Hazelwood				
Q40	.110	.100	.100	.169*#	.125*#	.132	.083	.158

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence
*** Significant at .001 level of confidence
\# Highest V score for advisers/editors

Table 5. Cramer's V Correlations Indicating Importance of School/Community Characteristics

	Region		Community Size		School Size	
	Ed.	Adv.	Ed.	Adv.	Ed.	Adv.
			Self-Restraint			
			Intimidation			
Q10	.127	.170*	.099	.156*	.053	.143*
			Deference			
Q11	.158*	.117	.099	.078	.137*	.035
Q14	.104	.126	.113	.037	.074	.088
			Self-Censorship			
Q12	.161*	.208***	.160**	.100	.143*	.060
Q13	.126	.221**	.065	.091	.147*	.092
Q16	.134	.178	.085	.075	.092	.100
Q20	.113	.143	.074	.112	.080	.043
			Responsibility			
Q29	.091	.095	.108	.110	.118	.024
Av.	.127#	.157#	.100	.095	.106	.073
			Adviser Pressure			
Q15	.132	.153	.108	.110	.148**	.158*
Q17	.170*	.119	.061	.046	.088	.083
Q21	.092	.122	.097	.046	.076	.028
Av.	.131#	.131#	.089	.067	.104	.090
			Prior Review			
Q26	.159*	.136	.060	.037	.109	.100
Q27	.153*	.099	.078	.077	.102	.140*
Av.	.156#	.118	.069	.057	.106	.120#
			Prior Restraint			
Q18	.076	.128	.058	.058	.128	.144
Q19	.174*	.145	.013	.021	.193**	.163*
Q22	.093	.083	.082	.022	.082	.041
Q23	.057	.111	.066	.161*	.061	.147
Q24	.157	.104	.037	.074	.065	.037
Q25	.077	.191	.187**	.177*	.089	.143
Q28	.078	.087	.023	.111	.065	.112
Av.	.102#	.121#	.067	.089	.098	.112
			Opinion of Hazelwood			
Q40	.176**#	.122	.055	.155*	.110	.186**#

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence
*** Significant at .001 level of confidence
# Highest V score for advisers/editors

Table 6. Cramer's V Correlations Indicating Importance of Adviser Characteristics

	Gender	College Jrn. Hours	Advising Experience	Professional Memberships
		Self-Restraint		
		Intimidation		
Q10	.115	.050	.074	.147*
		Deference		
Q11	.105	.105	.056	.185**
Q14	.087	.051	.118	.106
		Self-Censorship		
Q12	.008	.143*	.090	.110
Q13	.078	.077	.087	.061
Q16	.077	.043	.080	.101
Q20	.069	.165*	.213**	.049
		Responsibility		
Q29	.044	.057	.036	.196**
	.073	.086	.094	.119#
		Adviser Pressure		
Q15	.141	.122	.074	.166**
Q17	.030	.071	.126	.110
Q21	.064	.133	.227**	.057
	.078	.109	.142#	.111
		Prior Review		
Q26	.104	.110	.060	.084
Q27	.085	.100	.145*	.098
	.095	.105#	.103	.091
		Prior Restraint		
Q18	.007	.103	.115	.137
Q19	.019	.048	.102	.050
Q22	.070	.082	.104	.089
Q23	.070	.088	.025	.085
Q24	.075	.036	.133	.116
Q25	.075	.173*	.186*	.167
Q28	.094	.100	.025	.031
	.059	.090	.099#	.096
		Opinion of Hazelwood		
Q40	.065	.179**	.166**	.251***#

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence
*** Significant at .001 level of confidence
# Highest V score for advisers/editors

Table 7. Overall Variance (V Scores) for Responses of Editors and Advisers, Controlling for Respondent Characteristics

	Editors	Advisers
Community/School Characteristics		
Region/Location	.122	.137
Community size	.070	.085
School size	.103	.094
Newspaper Characteristics		
Whether credit is given	.058	.064
Publication periodicity	.077	.082
Type of publication policy	.172	.172
Source of publication policy	.190	.156
Individual Characteristics		
Gender	.053	.071
College journalism hours taken	-	.093
Advising/teaching experience	-	.104
Membership in journalism organizations	-	.107

Table 8: Advisers' and Editors' Opinion of the **Hazelwood** Ruling

Do you agree with the Supreme Court's **Hazelwood** ruling that gave the school board and the principal the right to control the content of student publications that are not public forums?

	Ed.	Adv.
No	70%	62%
Yes	14%	11%
No opinion	16%	27%

Note: V = .137, significant at .01 level of confidence.